

REMARKS

In the February 13, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 pending in the application. Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, Applicant amends claims 1, 5 and 7. Support for the amended claims may be found in the originally filed specification, and thus, no new matter is added by this amendment. Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-10 (3 independent claims; 10 total claims) remain pending in the application. Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

In the telephone interview of April 9, 2003, the Examiner and the Applicant's representative, David O. Caplan, discussed the Final Office Action of February 13, 2003, the Weston reference (GB 2174663A), and proposed amendments to independent claims 1, 5 and 7. As was discussed during the interview, Applicant maintained that Applicant's invention is patentable over the cited prior art. Agreement with respect to the claims was reached as follows. Applicant agreed to amend the independent claims to include the feature of the "rotation of said knob corresponds to a specific alphanumeric value." (emphasis added) Examiner agreed that the proposed amendments would overcome the rejections in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 5 and 7 as discussed with the Examiner.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA"), in view of John L. Weston, UK Patent Application, GB 2174663A (hereinafter "Weston"). In addition, claims 4, 7, and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA, in view of Weston, and further in view of Aerospace Engineering (December 1994, hereinafter "Aerospace Engineering"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 5 and 7 as discussed with the Examiner. As noted above, during the telephone conference of April 9, 2003, the Examiner agreed that the proposed amendments would overcome the rejections in the Office Action. Specifically, the

Examiner agreed that the proposed amendments would make the claims patentable over the cited references as AAPA, Weston, or Aerospace Engineering does not disclose, teach or suggest "rotation of said knob corresponds to a specific alphanumeric value" (emphasis added).

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that each and every element of independent claims 1, 5, and 7 are not rendered obvious by AAPA in view of Weston, or by AAPA in view of Weston, and further in view of Aerospace Engineering. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal to rejection of claims 1, 5 and 7 (and claims 2-4, 6, and 8-10 which variously depend from claims 1, 5 and 7) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Should the Office wish to discuss any of the above in greater detail or deem that further amendments should be made to improve the form of the claims, then the Office is invited to telephone the undersigned at the Office's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11-APRIL-2003

By: 
David O. Caplan
Reg. No. 41,655

Snell & Wilmer L.L.P.
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
(602) 382-6284